Reply to Official Action of July 27, 2004

## **REMARKS**

Applicants again appreciate the thorough examination of the present application, as evidenced by the third Official Action. The third Official Action now rejects all of the pending claims, namely Claims 33-56, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as reciting subject matter that the specification did not describe with sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. Presuming the specification to be enabling, however, the Official Action also rejects all of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,787,403 to Randle, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,285 to Damico et al., and further in view of a 1995 Web publication entitled: *Internet Holes: 50 Ways to Attack your Web Systems* (hereinafter the "Web publication").

As explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification of the present application is, in fact, described with sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention, as required by § 112, first paragraph. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention of the present application is patentably distinct from the Randle patent, the Damico patent and the Web publication, taken individually or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of all of the pending claims for failure to provide an enabling disclosure, and as being unpatentable over the combination of the Randle patent, Damico patent and Web publication. Further, to claim additional patentable features of the claimed invention, Applicants have added new Claims 57-60. In light of the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

## I. The Specification Is Enabling Under § 112, First Paragraph

As indicated above, the third Official Action rejects Claims 33-56 as reciting subject matter that the specification did not describe with sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. More particularly, the Official Action alleges that the specification fails to enable one skilled in the art as to how the network address of the datastore is modified to incorporate the network address of the intermediary gateway. In addition, the Official Action alleges that the specification fails to enable one skilled in the art as to how access

Reply to Official Action of July 27, 2004

to the network accessible datastore is provided through the intermediary gateway device using the modified address. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the specification is, in fact, enabling with respect to modifying the network address of a datastore to incorporate the network address of the intermediary gateway, as well as with respect to how the datastore is accessed through the intermediary gateway device using the modified address.

As shown in FIG. 1 and described on pages 10 and 32-33, URL (uniform resource locutor) munging is a technique whereby the goods and services of a number of merchants can be displayed through a single virtual shopping center, provided by an intermediary gateway. Thus, when a user desires to access a network-addressable datastore, such as that provided by a merchant, the user provides a request that includes the address (e.g., URL) of the network-addressable datastore. The address of the network-addressable datastore is then modified to incorporate the address of the intermediary gateway such that retrieval of content from the network-addressable datastore passes through the intermediary gateway.

For example, as explained on page 33 of the present application, consider a network-addressable datastore having the URL "www.anywhere.com," and an intermediary gateway having the URL "www.travelgenie.com." In such an instance, a request to access the network-addressable datastore includes the URL "www.anywhere.com," which can be modified or otherwise munged to incorporate the URL of the intermediary gateway, as follows: "www.travelgenie.com? www.anywhere.com." As will be appreciated by those skilled in the art, the modified URL can be interpreted as directing a request to the intermediary gateway URL "www.travelgenie.com," with the request including the argument "www.anywhere.com" (i.e., network-addressable datastore URL) after the character "?." See Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Request for Comments (RFC) 1738, entitled: *Uniform Resource Locators (URLs)*, Dec. 1994.

To access to the network-addressable datastore, the user could, for example, click on the modified URL or type it in a browser's search request (see page 33 of the present application). Such a request, then, could be received by the intermediary gateway (i.e., URL "www.travelgenie.com"). In turn, the intermediary gateway could be configured, in accordance with the described and claimed invention, to interpret the argument in the request as the user

Reply to Official Action of July 27, 2004

soliciting access to the network-addressable datastore (i.e., "www.anywhere.com") via the intermediary gateway. The intermediary gateway, then, could request content from the network-addressable datastore, and upon receipt of such content, forward it to the user. Access to the network-addressable datastore could therefore be provided through the intermediary gateway.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the specification of the present application does, in fact, enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention of Claims 33-56, as well as Claims 57-60. As such, Applicants also respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 33-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is overcome.

## II. The Claimed Invention is Patentable over Randle, Damico and Web Publication

Also as indicated above, the Official Action rejects Claims 33-56 as being unpatentable over the Randle patent in view of the Damico patent, and further in view of the "Web publication." More particularly, the Official Action alleges that the Randle patent discloses a method for managing information using an intermediary gateway device having a corresponding network address, where the method includes receiving a request to communicate with a datastore having a network address, and providing access to the datastore through the intermediary gateway device. The Official Action alleges that the Damico patent discloses modifying the network address of the datastore, as recited by the claimed invention. The Official Action then alleges that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify the system of the Randle patent to include the address modification feature of the Damico patent to track user paths on the Web to determine the identity of the entity that directed the user to the current Web site for transactional purposes.

While the Official Action concedes that neither the Randle patent nor the Damico patent, individually or in combination, teach or suggest modifying the network address of the datastore to incorporate the address of the intermediary gateway device, as also recited by the claimed invention, the Official Action alleges that the Web publication discloses this feature. The Official Action further alleges that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify the combined system of the Randle and Damico patents to include the address incorporation feature of the Web publication to route all requests through the gateway.

Reply to Official Action of July 27, 2004

As recited by independent Claims 33, 35, 37, 39, 41-45, 47, 49, 51 and 53-56 of the present application, methods, computers, computer-readable mediums and apparatuses are provided for managing information. As recited, a request to communicate with a network-accessible datastore is received. Then, access is provided to the network-accessible datastore through an intermediary gateway device using a network address (URL) incorporating the address (URL) of the network-accessible datastore and an address (URL) of an intermediary gateway device. In this regard, the address (URL) of the network-accessible datastore is modified to incorporate the address (URL) of the intermediary gateway device.

As explained in response to the second Official Action, in contrast to the claimed invention of independent Claims 33, 35, 37, 39, 41-45, 47, 49, 51 and 53-56 (as well as new Claims 57-60), and in contrast to the allegation of the Official Action, the Randle patent does not teach or suggest providing access to a network-accessible datastore through an intermediary gateway device having a network address. The Randle patent discloses a bank-centric service platform that provides an access gateway from a bank at a central location to non-bank information, products and services of providers not otherwise related to the bank. The Randle patent does not disclose that the access gateway has a network address, as does the intermediary gateway device of the claimed invention.

In further contrast to the claimed invention of the present application, and as conceded by the Official Action, the Randle patent does not teach or suggest modifying the network address of the datastore. However, the Official Action alleges that the Damico patent discloses this feature, and that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify the system of the Randle patent to include the address modification feature of the Damico patent to track user paths on the Web to determine the identity of the entity that directed the user to the current Web site for transactional purposes. In contrast to the Official Action, Applicants respectfully submit that even if the Damico patent discloses the address-modification feature, the motivation suggested by the Official Action for combining the Randle and Damico patents is lacking.

As previously explained, the Randle patent does not disclose a network comprising the Web, the Internet or any other Wide Area Network (WAN). In fact, the only network disclosed by the Randle patent appears to be the bank-centric network including the bank centric service

Reply to Official Action of July 27, 2004

platform, the customer and providers of non-bank information, products and services. Even if the Randle patent did disclose the Web interconnecting the bank centric service platform, the customer and providers of non-bank information, products and services, however, the bank centric service platform would not modify the address of a provider of non-bank information, products and services to identify itself since to do so would be illogical. And since the Randle patent is focused on the bank centric service platform and its operation, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify the Randle system to provide further features of the providers of non-bank information, products and services since to do so would not further advance the bank centric service platform. Thus, the necessary motivation to combine the Randle and Damico patents is lacking.

Presuming for the sake of explanation that the Randle and Damico systems can be combined as alleged by the third Official Action, neither the Randle patent nor the Damico patent, individually or in combination, teach or suggest modifying the network address of the datastore to incorporate the address of the intermediary gateway device, as conceded by the Official Action and also recited by the claimed invention. Nonetheless, the Official Action alleges that the Web publication discloses this feature, and that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify the combined system of the Randle and Damico patents to include the address incorporation feature of the Web publication to route all requests through the gateway. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that not only does the Web publication not disclose modifying the network address of the datastore to incorporate the address of the intermediary gateway device, as recited by the claimed invention; one skilled in the art would not have found it obvious to combine the Web publication with the Randle and Damico patents even if the Web publication did disclose the address-incorporation feature.

The Web publication discloses, as the title suggests, fifty means to attack Web systems by means of a number of vulnerabilities of the Internet. Of the described means, the Official Action cites number fifty-two, namely, rewriting URLs on the fly to redirect requests. In this regard, the Web publication discloses that a server, operating as a gateway, can rewrite requested URLs to route service through the gateway. More particularly, the Web publication explains that in various instances a self-declared gateway may have a list of other servers, from which a user

Reply to Official Action of July 27, 2004

selects a server with which to request access. The self-declared gateway then writes the URL of the requested server as a fake address in the gateway, and handles the request to the selected server, and receives documents from the server in response to the request. The gateway can then rewrite URLs in the received documents before passing those documents to the user, the rewritten URLs directing future requests through the gateway.

As explained above, the Web publication does disclose "rewriting URLs." The Web publication does not, however, teach or suggest rewriting a URL by incorporating the network address (e.g., URL) of an intermediary gateway device into the network address (e.g., URL) of a datastore. In fact, the Web publication does not teach or suggest exactly how the URLs are rewritten. The Web publication merely discloses that the URLs are rewritten "to continue routing all service through the gateway." As will be appreciated, however, all service could be routed through the gateway by merely rewriting the URLs to replace the addresses of datastores with that of the gateway, and not incorporate the address of the gateway in the addresses of the datastores, similar to the manner recited by the claimed invention.

Moreover, even considering for the sake of argument that the Web publication does disclose modifying the network address of the datastore to incorporate the address of the intermediary gateway device, Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not have found the motivation or suggestion to combine the Web publication with the Randle and Damico patents. As explained above, the Randle patent, on the other hand, relates to a bankcentric service platform that provides an access gateway from a bank at a central location to nonbank information, products and services of providers not otherwise related to the bank. The Damico patent relates to capturing and storing a co-marketer identification symbol representing the identity of an entity that has referred a user to a computer service. Both patents therefore relate to forms of electronic commerce for which one skilled in the art would undoubtedly find desirable to provide without being attacked by exposing vulnerabilities of the Internet. The Web publication, however, directly relates to exposing those vulnerabilities to attack service providers, such as those of the very type that would benefit from the systems disclosed by the Randle and Damico patents. As such, not only would one skilled in the art not be motivated to to combine the Web publication with the Randle and Damico patents, one skilled in the art would

Reply to Official Action of July 27, 2004

be more likely be motivated to take measures to prevent the teachings of the Web publication from being incorporated in the systems disclosed by the Randle and Damico patents, at least as far us those teachings relate to attacking vulnerabilities of the Internet.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the Randle patent, the Damico patent or Web publication, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed invention of independent Claims 33, 35, 37, 39, 41-45, 47, 49, 51, 53-56, or even new Claims 57-60. Also, as dependent Claims 34, 36, 38, 40, 46, 48, 50 and 52, depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 33, 35, 37, 39, 41-45, 47, 49, 51, 53-56, Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the Randle patent, the Damico patent or Web publication, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed invention of dependent Claims 34, 36, 38, 40, 46, 48, 50 and 52. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 33-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome.

Reply to Official Action of July 27, 2004

## CONCLUSION

In view of the added claims and the remarks presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew T. Spence

Registration No. 45,699

Customer No. 00826 ALSTON & BIRD LLP Bank of America Plaza 101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000 Charlotte, NC 28280-4000 Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000 Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office at Fax No. (703)

872-9806 on the date shown below.

Sarah B. Simmons

10-27-04